

REMARKS

Claim 1 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 9-13 are added.
Therefore, claims 2-13 are the claims now pending in the Application.

The Examiner objected to claims 2 and 3 as depending from rejected claim 1, but stated that claims 2 and 3 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 2 and 3 are now rewritten in independent form.

Formal Matters

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings filed on October 10, 2001.
2. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner review and consider the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed August 4, 2003, and so indicate in the next Office correspondence.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Miyakawa, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,790,632). This rejection is traversed.

Claims 1 is cancelled and therefore the rejection is moot as to this claim.

Claim 6 depends from newly independent claim 2, which the Examiner stated is allowable. Therefore, claim 6 incorporates novel and nonobvious features of claim 2 and is

patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Funada, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,486,760) in view of Kida, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,321,789). This rejection is traversed.

Claims 1 is cancelled and therefore the rejection is moot as to this claim.

Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 depend, directly or indirectly, from newly independent claim 2, which the Examiner stated is allowable. Therefore, claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of claim 2 and are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that claim 2 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

New claims 9-13 are added. These claims are fully supported by Applicant's originally filed disclosure and are patentable over the prior art for at least the reason that they depend, directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 3. New claims 9-13 are not believed to raise new issues that would require further searching and should be entered.

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration and allowance of this Application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.


AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

U.S. Application No. 09/972,964

Q66482

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 12, 2003